

Appln. No. 10/621,409
Amd. dated February 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2004

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated November 17, 2004, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

In response to the claim objection presented on page two of the Action, claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 9, which, as the Examiner indicates, provides antecedent basis for the recitations in claim 12. It is therefore requested that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The indication of allowability of claims 3, 4 and 6-12 is noted with appreciation. In view of this indication, claim 3 has been placed into independent form by incorporation of the entirety of its subject matter into claim 1, claim 4 has been amended to depend directly from claim 1 and claims 6, 7 and 9-11 have been placed in independent form by incorporation therein of all of the subject matter of original claim 1. Claim 5 remains dependent from amended claim 1.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 as unpatentable over Wright in view of Takei, as noted above, the applicability of this rejection to claims 1 and 5 has been eliminated by incorporation of the subject matter of allowable claim 3 into claim 1 and by the continued dependence of claim 5 from amended claim 1.

However, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is traversed for the reason that claim 2, which has been

amended to place it in independent form, defines a structure that is not suggested by any combination of the teachings of the applied references.

With respect to the subject matter included in the original claim 2, the Examiner referred to Figures 2 and 7 of Takei. These Figures do not disclose the features defined in original claim 2, and now defined, in somewhat modified form, in amended claim 2. Moreover, no disclosure of these features has been found in the Takei patent.

Specifically, claim 2 specifies that the armature windings and the field magnets, respectively, are juxtaposed so that the spacing between any adjacent pair thereof increases in the circular direction, which is the direction of relative movement between the turntable and the bed, as the radial distance, i.e. the distance from the center of rotation, increases. This feature is illustrated in Figures 4-8 and 11 of the Application drawings, which show that the armature windings and field magnets have rectangular shapes such that the spacing between two adjacent ones thereof increases as the distance from the center of rotation increases.

Such a relationship between armature windings, or between field magnets, is not illustrated or disclosed in the Takei reference. In the explanation of the rejection of claim

Appln. No. 10/621,409
Amd. dated February 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2004

2, the Examiner made specific reference to Figures 2 and 7 of the Takei reference. Figure 2 shows generally rectangular armature coils 32 which appear to be so configured that the spacing between adjacent coils is constant in the radial direction. It is noted, in this connection, that the patent Specification simply states that those coils are wound roughly into the shape of a rectangular loop. Specification, column 4, lines 23-24. The structure shown in Figure 2 has only a slight curvature and there is no basis for concluding that coils that are roughly rectangular will be so constructed as to have the increasing spacing defined in claim 2 of the present Application.

Even more clearly, the poles of magnet 79 shown in Figure 7 of the patent drawing are constructed to be in abutting relation so that the spacing between those poles also does not increase in the radial direction.

It is therefore submitted that Takei does not disclose either armature windings or field magnets having a variable spacing, as defined in claim 2 of the present Application.

It is therefore requested that the prior art rejection of claim 2 be reconsidered and withdrawn, that all of the pending claims be allowed and that the Application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/621,409
Amd. dated February 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2004

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:dtb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\O\Onak\tsuboi7\pto\AMD 16FEB05.doc